

Comprehensive Plan Subcommittee  
Wednesday, March 8, 2006

Attendees:

Ginny Kelleher  
Carolyn Stevenson  
Jack Hart  
Gloria Del Greco  
Ken Kingshill

Town Staff-  
Al Salzman

Throgmartin-Henke Development-  
Steve Henke

Al Salzman introduced the newest member of the subcommittee, Ken Kingshill, and went over the ground rules for the subcommittee and the agenda for the evening. He explained that two petitions would be considered, and that a brief work session was planned for after the two agenda items were resolved.

Consideration of the first petition began with Steve Henke providing a site plan for the proposed development and describing the existing site conditions. He identified the surrounding uses and described the proposed infrastructure improvements to the site. He described the proposed housing type ("H" lots and homes, as defined by the terms of the Bridgewater PUD) and the details that would be added to the subject site to maintain consistency with the Bridgewater Club and other abutting developments.

Through discussion between the subcommittee members, the petitioner and staff, it was made clear that the proposed internal roads would be private, the entrance would be gated, and that alley access was not proposed. It was further clarified that while existing buffers provided on abutting sites negated the need for buffering on the part of the proposed development, the petition would provide the required yards and plantings, as well as possibly providing decorative stone walls to augment the buffers at the site. It was also made clear that a path connection to the school property from the north property line would be provided, perimeter paths would connect to existing perimeter paths from abutting projects, and efforts would be made to tie in to the existing trail network in the Brookside subdivision if possible.

The committee determined that no further consideration of the petition was necessary, and forwarded the petition to the full ACP with a positive recommendation.

Tomlinson Terrace -  
Chuck Wright, PC Wright & Associates  
Steve Abt

Consideration of the second petition began at 8PM, with Chuck Wright introducing the petition briefly and then explaining the details of a proposed list of commitments. Subcommittee members and the petitioner exchanged ideas regarding the commitments, and generally agreed with the proposed commitments, with minor clarifications and corrections.

Dr. Kelleher asked staff to present any potential issues with the proposal. Staff presented several potential issues for the petitioner and subcommittee members to consider. Staff proposed the idea that the subject site, while contiguous to an established town boundary, was not contiguous with other developed areas and therefore not consistent with the policies of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Members of the committee stated that they did not feel the proposed development was inconsistent with the policy of contiguous growth as stated in the 2020 Plan, as public water and sewer were available immediately adjacent to the subject site. Committee members also referenced the school-owned property to the south and the development of that site as a future school as evidence of eventual contiguity.

Staff stated the concern that the proposed development was located too close to the area that the Corridor subcommittee had identified for potential future growth along US 31. Staff indicated that abutting properties to the east were owned by an investment group, already had several acres of intensive commercial zoning, and were likely to develop as a large-scale commercial or office use. Staff stated that the location of “high-end, custom and semi-custom” homes adjacent to this area could potentially impair the ability of the abutting site to develop for the anticipated commercial purposes, or could limit the ability to effectively transition from any intense commercial use to the proposed dwellings. Committee members stated that the subject site was located approximately half a mile from the US 31 right-of-way, and that the abutting site should have ample room to transition between uses. Committee members further stated that the configuration of the site would only locate two dwellings near the potential commercial site, so any impact would be minimal.

Staff then indicated that several other opportunities for similar types of housing exist within the Township, and cited examples such as Viking Meadows, the Bridgewater Club, and Langston’s Brookside. Staff indicated that these subdivisions were already under development, and that while there was demonstrable demand for this product, there was no shortage of other opportunity available. Staff voiced the opinion that while the proposed development was appropriate, it would also be acceptable to wait until additional development reached this area before proposing any change in zoning for this site. Committee responses included the opinion that if the market could be shown to exist, there was no real reason to wait, and that the northeast portion of the township was in need of this type of housing project.

The petitioner presented an inventory of the wooded portion of the subject site, and indicated that the majority of the trees were not worthy of preservation efforts. Staff proposed the subject site be developed in a manner consistent with Conservation Subdivision Principles, and again stated that it would be appropriate to delay the development of the site until such an ordinance was created. Committee members expressed support for the CSD ideal, but did not recommend the petitioner delay development.

Staff presented the petitioner with a list of expected commitments, including:

- The dedication of a 40' half right-of-way along Tomlinson Road,
- The clearing of any tree located within the dedicated r-o-w,
- The provision of an acceleration/deceleration lane on Tomlinson Road,
- The provision of a boulevard (separated) entryway from Tomlinson Road,
- The location of all components of the boulevard entryway outside of the 40' r-o-w of Tomlinson Road,
- The provision of an 8' asphalt path or a 5' concrete sidewalk within the Tomlinson Road r-o-w,
- The provision of internal sidewalks.
- An improved, paved stub street shall be provided to the property to the west.

Staff stated that the proposed development involved land that was currently part of a pair of nonconforming lots, and that the proposed development would likely alter the grandfathered status of the two lots. Staff stated that they would provide more information to the petitioner in this regard.

The petitioner was further informed that the proposed street trees, shown between the curb and sidewalk, would not be permitted by WPWD. The petitioner indicated they would speak to WPWD regarding this practice.

Staff requested that the petitioner demonstrate that the proposed side- or rear-loaded garages would fit on the proposed lots. The petitioner indicated that this information would be available at a future meeting.

Staff asked what improvements the petitioner would be making to the proposed common area. The petitioner indicated that none would be provided. Staff also asked that the homes located along the proposed future right-of-way of 196<sup>th</sup> Street have Building Materials and Orientation standards that would be comparable to those of a façade oriented to an existing public right-of-way. The petitioner did not agree, and indicated that the proposed 40' tree preservation strip would be adequate to prevent any negative views from the future 196<sup>th</sup> Street. The committee members agreed, and did not request the petitioner make any such commitment.